



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,883	09/16/2003	Aleksey Sanin	AOL0073	8888

7590 07/20/2006

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 Edison Way
Suite L
Menlo Park, CA 94025

EXAMINER

CÀO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/666,883	Applicant(s) SANIN, ALEKSEY	
	Examiner Phuong-Thao Cao	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/24/06 & 5/17/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 05/17/2006.
2. Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18, 21-23 and 25-26 were amended. Currently, claims 1-26 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statements filed on 3/24/2006 and 5/17/2006 have been received and considered. Copies of the reviewed IDS(s) are enclosed with this office action.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: an extra 'a' in the limitation "on a *a* service provider site" on line 5. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Call (US Patent No 6,154,738).

As to claim 1, Call teaches:

“A process for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource” (see [column 1, lines 40-67] wherein universal product code identifying a specific product which can be considered as an identifier associated with information about the product, and a web page or file containing product information is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource”; also see [column 4, lines 1-15] and [column 15, lines 47-67]), the process comprising the steps of:

“a central server receiving a resource information request from a resource requestor concerning a particular resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 10-15 and 30-42] and [column 5, lines 30-45] wherein the server computer implementing the product code translator [column 5, lines 40-45] is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”);

“extracting a fixed service provider resource identifier from said resource information request, said service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with an associated service provider resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-45] and [column 5, lines 30-40] wherein a file containing product information located by an internet address is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource”, universal product code identifying a product also used to identify the file containing information about the product is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource identifier”, and the product code or identifier must be extracted from the request message or query as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language to perform a lookup operation as disclosed; also see [column 1, lines 53-60] and [column 17, lines 20-25] for a one to one correspondence between an identifier and information resource);

“providing a source information database resident on said central server that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to service provider resource information, said database containing resource information for all service providers within the central server’s area of responsibility, said resource information for each resource comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-55], [column 4, lines 30-42], [column 5, lines 30-50], [column 8, lines 30-65] and Fig. 2 wherein the server computer implementing the product code translator [column 5, lines 40-45] is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, and its relational database is equivalent to a source information database as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also see [column 6, lines 55-67] and [column 33, lines 1-10] wherein URL and other cross referencing information is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource information”); and

“said central server accessing said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and retrieving associated service provider resource’s information from said database” (see [column 5, lines 30-40] and [column 8, lines 40-50] wherein universal product code is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource identifier”; also see [column 4, lines 30-42]).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said central server’s area of responsibility is locally, assignment or trust based” (see [column 5, lines 42-55] and [column 25, lines 35-50]).

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said service provider resource identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)” (see [column 21, lines 5-25 and 50-55] wherein domain name is equivalent to Applicant’s “universal resource identifier”).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said central server returns the retrieved service provider resource information to said resource requestor” (see [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-45] and [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein the server implementing the product code translator is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, and information including internet addresses and other information concerning the universal product code are equivalent to Applicant’s “the retrieved service provider resource information”).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 4 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said central server verifies said resource information request before returning the retrieved service provider resource information” (see [column 6, lines 15-55] wherein the disclosure of using certificate or digital signature to provide data access to authorized requesters suggests Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the URL from the retrieved service provider resource information to access the resource from the service provider” (see [column 2, lines 35-

45], [column 4, lines 30-40] and [column 15, lines 47-65] wherein requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant's "resource requestor").

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

"wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved said service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user" (see [column 23, lines 10-50], [column 25, lines 35-65] and [column 26, lines 1-20] wherein product description is equivalent to Applicant's "resource description"; also see [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein information about the manufacturer is a resource description relating to the source of the file containing product information wherein the file containing product information is equivalent to Applicant's "resource").

As to claim 8, Call teaches:

"A process for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource" (see [column 1, lines 40-67] wherein universal product code identifying a specific product which can be considered as an identifier associated with information about the product, and a web page containing product information is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider resource"; also see [column 4, lines 1-15] and [column 15, lines 47-67]), the process comprising the steps of:

“a service provider site receiving a resource information request from a resource requestor concerning a particular resource” (see [column 15, lines 27-55] wherein Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “a service provider site”; also see [column 32, lines 37-40]);

“extracting a fixed service provider resource identifier from said resource information request, said service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with an associated service provider resource” (see [column 15, lines 25-55] wherein ISBN number is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource identifier”, the disclosure of performing a table lookup operation suggest the extracting as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language, and for each ISBN number (identifier) only one URL (resource) is retrieved as disclosed suggests the one to one correspondence as in Applicant’s claim language; also see [column 1, lines 53-60] and [column 17, lines 20-25] for a one to one correspondence between an identifier and information resource);

“providing a resource information database resident on said service provider site that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to information concerning associated resources of said service provider, said database resource information for each resource comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource” (see [column 15, lines 25-45] wherein Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider site”, file-based database is equivalent to a resource information database as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language, information on books; also see [column 6, lines 54-67] and [column 8, lines 53-60] for information concerning associated resources stored in database; also see [column 33, lines 1-10]); and

“said service provider site accessing said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and retrieving associated service provider resource information from said database” (see [column 15, lines 25-60] and [column 33, lines 1-10] wherein Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider site” and the disclosure of performing a table lookup operation to retrieve the URL suggests the accessing database using an ISBN number (extracted service resource identifier) and retrieving information as in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said service provider resource identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)” (see [column 21, lines 5-25 and 50-55] wherein domain name is equivalent to Applicant’s “universal resource identifier”).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said server provider site returns the retrieved service provider resource information to said resource requestor” (see [column 15, lines 27-55] and [column 33, lines 1-5] wherein the Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider site”, requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, and information including internet addresses

and other cross-referencing information are equivalent to Applicant's "the retrieved service provider resource information").

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

"wherein said service provider site verifies said resource information request before returning the retrieved service provider resource information" (see [column 6, lines 15-55] wherein the disclosure of using certificate or digital signature to provide data access to authorized requesters suggests Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

"wherein said resource requestor uses the URL from the retrieved service provider resource information to access the resource from the service provider" (see [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-40] and [column 15, lines 47-65] wherein requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant's "resource requestor").

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved said service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user” (see [column 23, lines 10-50], [column 25, lines 35-65] and [column 26, lines 1-20] wherein product description is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource description”; also see [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein information about the manufacturer is a resource description relating to the source of the file containing product information wherein the file containing product information is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource”).

As to claim 14, Call teaches:

“An apparatus for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource” (see [column 1, lines 40-67] wherein universal product code identifying a specific product which can be considered as an identifier associated with information about the product, and a web page or file containing product information is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource”; also see [column 4, lines 1-15] and [column 15, lines 47-67]), the apparatus comprising:

“a request reception module on a central server configured to receive a resource information request from a resource requestor concerning a particular resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 10-15 and 30-42] and [column 5, lines 30-45] wherein the server computer implementing the product code translator [column 5, lines 40-45] is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource

requestor”, and the disclose of receiving request or accepting query suggests the inclusion of a request reception module as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language);

“an extraction module configured to extract a fixed service provider resource identifier from said resource information request, said service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with an associated service provider resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-45] and [column 5, lines 30-40] wherein a file containing product information located by an internet address is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource”, universal product code identifying a product also used to identify the file containing information about the product is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource identifier”, and the product code or identifier must be extracted from the request message or query by an extraction module as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language to perform a lookup operation as disclosed; also see [column 1, lines 53-60] and [column 17, lines 20-25] for a one to one correspondence between an identifier and information resource);

“a source information database resident on said central server that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to service provider resource information, said database containing resource information for all service providers within the central server’s area of responsibility, said resource information for each resource comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-55], [column 4, lines 30-42], [column 5, lines 30-50], [column 8, lines 30-65] and Fig. 2 wherein the server computer implementing the product code translator [column 5, lines 40-45] is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, and its relational database is equivalent to a source information database as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also see [column 6,

lines 55-67] and [column 33, lines 1-10] wherein URL and other cross referencing information is equivalent to Applicant's "resource information"); and

"an accessing and retrieval module, configured to access said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and to retrieve associated service provider resource's information from said database" (see [column 5, lines 30-40], [column 8, lines 40-50] and [column 33, lines 1-10] wherein universal product code is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider resource identifier" and performing a table lookup function by searching cross-reference table for URL and other cross-reference information requires the inclusion of an accessing and retrieval module as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also see [column 4, lines 30-42])).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

"wherein said central server's area of responsibility is locally, assignment or trust based" (see [column 5, lines 42-55] and [column 25, lines 35-50]).

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said service provider resource identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)” (see [column 21, lines 5-25 and 50-55] wherein domain name is equivalent to Applicant’s “universal resource identifier”).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said central server returns the retrieved service provider resource information to said resource requestor” (see [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-45] and [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein the server implementing the product code translator is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, and information including internet addresses and other information concerning the universal product code are equivalent to Applicant’s “the retrieved service provider resource information”).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 17 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said central server verifies said resource information request before returning the retrieved service provider resource information” (see [column 6, lines 15-55] wherein the disclosure of using certificate or digital signature to provide data access to authorized requesters suggests Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the URL from the retrieved service provider resource information to access the resource from the service provider” (see [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-40] and [column 15, lines 47-65] wherein requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved said service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user” (see [column 23, lines 10-50], [column 25, lines 35-65] and [column 26, lines 1-20] wherein product description is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource description”; also see [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein information about the manufacturer is a resource description relating to the source of the file containing product information wherein the file containing product information is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource”).

As to claim 21, Call teaches:

“An apparatus for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource” (see [column 1, lines 40-67] wherein universal product code identifying a specific product which can be considered as an identifier associated with information about the product, and a web page containing product information is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource”; also see [column 4, lines 1-15] and [column 15, lines 47-67]), the apparatus comprising:

“a request reception module on a service provider site configured to receive a resource information request from a resource requestor concerning a particular resource” (see [column 15, lines 27-55] wherein Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “a service provider site” and the disclosure of processing HTTP message or request implies the receiving that HTTP request and must include a request reception module as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also see [column 32, lines 37-40]);

“an extraction module configured to extract a fixed service provider resource identifier from said resource information request, said service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with an associated service provider resource” (see [column 15, lines 25-55] wherein ISBN number is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource identifier”, the disclosure of performing a table lookup operation suggest the extracting and the inclusion of an extraction module as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language, and for each ISBN number (identifier) only one URL (resource) is retrieved as disclosed suggests the one to one correspondence as in Applicant’s claim language; also see [column 1, lines 53-60] and [column 17, lines 20-25] for a one to one correspondence between an identifier and information resource);

“a resource information database resident on said service provider site that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to information concerning associated resources of said service provider, said database resource information for each resource comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource” (see [column 15, lines 25-45] wherein Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider site”, file-based database is equivalent to a resource information database as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language, information on books; also see [column 6, lines 54-67] and [column 8, lines 53-60] for information concerning associated resources stored in database; also see [column 33, lines 1-10]); and

“an accessing and retrieval module, configured to access said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and to retrieve associated service provider resource information from said database” (see [column 15, lines 25-60] and [column 33, lines 1-10] wherein Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider site” and the disclosure of performing a table lookup operation to retrieve the URL suggests the accessing database using an ISBN number (extracted service resource identifier) and retrieving information which must be performed by an accessing and retrieval module as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said service provider resource identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)”
(see [column 21, lines 5-25 and 50-55] wherein domain name is equivalent to Applicant’s
“universal resource identifier”).

As to claim 23, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim
21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said server provider site returns the retrieved service provider resource
information to said resource requestor” (see [column 15, lines 27-55] and [column 33, lines 1-5]
wherein the Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider site”, requesting browser
is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, and information including internet addresses
and other cross-referencing information are equivalent to Applicant’s “the retrieved service
provider resource information”).

As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim
23 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said service provider site verifies said resource information request before
returning the retrieved service provider resource information” (see [column 6, lines 15-55]
wherein the disclosure of using certificate or digital signature to provide data access to
authorized requesters suggests Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 25, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the URL from the retrieved service provider resource information to access the resource from the service provider” (see [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-40] and [column 15, lines 47-65] wherein requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”).

As to claim 26, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved said service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user” (see [column 23, lines 10-50], [column 25, lines 35-65] and [column 26, lines 1-20] wherein product description is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource description”; also see [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein information about the manufacturer is a resource description relating to the source of the file containing product information wherein the file containing product information is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource”).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PTC

July 14, 2006

Duke S. Nassum
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167